REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 7, 12 and 18 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1-22 remain pending in the application.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-12, 15-17 and 19-22 stand rejected as being anticipated by Cohen, et al. (US 6,389,462 B1). The Applicants traverse the rejections.

Anticipation requires that the disclosure of a single piece of prior art reveals **every** element, or limitation, of a claimed invention. Furthermore, the limitations that must be met by an anticipatory reference are those set forth in each statement of function in a claims limitations, and such a limitation cannot be met by an element in a reference that performs a different function, even though it may be part of a device embodying the same general overall concept. Cohen fails to teach each limitation of the rejected claims and, therefore, the Applicants traverse the rejection of each of those claims as being anticipated.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner rejected several arguments presented in Applicants' response to the prior Final Office Action, stating that certain phrases used in the arguments were not recited in the claims or were contradictory to the claim language. Although the Applicants' believe the prior claims were clear, certain amendments have been made herein to make express what was previously implicit in the claims. These amendments directly address the Examiner's statements and now clearly and expressly distinguish the claimed invention over Cohen.

Claims 1, as amended, now recites:

> 1. An apparatus for requesting a server to provide a service to an application, said apparatus comprising:
> an input for receiving from the application a service request including first information which directs said server to directly route to the application a data stream associated with said service;
> an information transformer coupled to said input, said information transformer operative to:

transform said service request including said first information into a modified service request containing second information; and, transmit said modified service request to said server, wherein said second information contained therein directs the server to indirectly route the data stream to said application via a proxy which is installed in a communication path intermediate to the server and the application, said proxy operable to perform a proxy operation on the data stream before it is delivered to said application. (emphasis added).

Claim 1 is directed to an apparatus which receives a service request from an application to order a server to send a data stream associated with the service. An information transformer transforms information in the service request in order to direct the server to route the data stream to a proxy in a communication path between the server and application. The data stream is operated on by a proxy function, whereby the data stream is treated by the proxy before the data stream reaches the application.

According to the teachings of Cohen, a proxy redirector manipulates a request to be sent to a proxy cache instead of to the origin server as determined by a DNS server. This redirection, which is a redirection of the request for an object, is used to find another storage of the proxy functionality that is requested. In contrast, Applicant's invention is characterized by an information transformer that manipulates information contained in the request to create a modified request. The modified request is transmitted to the server that hosts the desired object; i.e., the request is not redirected.

The server responds to receipt of the modified request by sending the requested datastream. The datastream, however, is not returned directly to the application that requested it; rather, the datastream is transmitted to a proxy intermediate to the server and the application; the proxy is operable to perform a proxy operation on the datastream before forwarding the datastream to the requesting application. Thus, according to Applicants' invention, the proxy operation is performed on the requested datastream and not on the request.

In other words, there is a difference between manipulating the address of the request (Cohen) and manipulating the content of the request indicating where to send a response to the request (Applicants' invention). Furthermore, the proxy redirector described by Cohen manipulates a request to be sent to a proxy cache instead of to the

origin server as determined by a DNS server, while Applicants' invention redirects a data stream, sent in response to a request, to a proxy in the return path that performs and operation on the data stream before it is delivered to the requesting application. Thus, whereas anticipation requires that the disclosure of a single piece of prior art reveal **every** element, or limitation, of a claimed invention, and Cohen fails to disclose those limitations of claim 1, Cohen fails to anticipate claim 1.

Whereas claim 12 includes limitations analogous to those of claim 1, Cohen also fails to anticipate that claim. Whereas claims 4-6 and 8- 11 are dependent from claim 1 and claims 15-17 and 19-22 are dependent from claim 12, and include the limitations of their respective base claims, those claims are also not anticipated by Cohen.

3.)   Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 2-3 and 13-14 as being unpatentable over Cohen in view of Gupta, *et al.* (US 6,567,857 B1); and claims 7 and 18 as being unpatentable over Cohen in view of Earl, *et al.* (US 6,112,228). The Applicants traverse the rejections.

Claims 1 and 12 have been shown, *supra*, to be patentable over Cohen. Gupta and Earl fail to cure the deficiencies of Cohen and, therefore, claims 1 and 12 are also patentable over Cohen in view of Gupta or Earl. Therefore, whereas claims 2-3 and 7 are dependent from claim 1 and claims 13-14 and 18 are dependent from claim 12, and include the limitations of their respective base claims, those claims are also patentable over Cohen in view of Gupta or Earl.

* * *

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-22.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542

Date: June 30, 2006

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-5799
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com